



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,127	12/15/2003	Jose La Rosa Ducato	P03,0574	3610

7590 02/20/2008
SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/736,127

Applicant(s)

DUCATO ET AL.

Examiner

CONG-LAC HUYNH

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 57-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 57-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/8/08.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 1/8/08 to the application filed on 12/15/03, priority 12/20/02.
2. Claims 1-56 are canceled.
3. Claims 57-60 are added.
4. Claims 57-60 are pending in the case. Claim 57 is an independent claim.

Priority

5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

6. The specification is objected to since it discloses a conflict regarding the two modes set by the resource pack computer program (page 11 to page 12).

In the first mode, the font mapping object container is accepted unchanged for a situation when installations use standard character collections (page 11, lines 15-19).

In the second mode, a character conversion of the document data stream is implemented, at least one corresponding replacement font is assembled, and the font mapping object container is emptied (page 11, lines 20-25).

The specification also discloses that the program reads the document and implements operations depending on the content of the font mapping object container.

When the font mapping object container *is emptied, there is no conversion*. This is the second mode disclosed in page 11.

When the font mapping object container comprises instructions for conversion fonts, (which means that the font mapping object container *is not emptied*) *the conversion is implemented* as disclosed as on page 12 which seems corresponding to the first mode. It makes sense when the font mapping object *container comprises instructions* for converting fonts, it implements conversion and it is *not emptied*. When the font mapping object *container is emptied, no font conversion occurs* since it does not include any conversion instructions. However, it sounds opposite to the disclosure on page 11, lines 20-24 where the conversion is implemented and assembled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding independent claims 57 and its dependent claim 59, claim 57 refers to the first mode where the font mapping object container is accepted unchanged for a situation when output devices associated with the second computer use standard character font sets and the second mode where a character conversion of the document data stream

is implemented, at least one corresponding replacement font is assembled and the font mapping object container is emptied.

Claim 59, on the other hand, recited that if the font mapping object container comprises instructions for font conversion, it implements the conversion (disclosed in specification both in page 11, #2 and page 12, #1), or if the font mapping object container is empty, then no font conversion occurs. Claim 59 appears inconsistent with claim 57 regarding the first mode and the second, and the situation of the font object mapping container.

Also in independent 57 and its dependent claim 59, it is unclear about the connection of the text file with the resource file and the AFP document data stream. The claim recites that the resource file "is sent at the same time together with said AFP document data stream from said first computer to said second computer" (see preamble). On the other hand, the text file includes instructions for conversion of characters for font mapping and provides a font mapping table for an AFP font mapping object container. The AFP font mapping object container is selected and finally sent together with the document data stream from the first computer to the second computer. Therefore, it appears that the selected container to be sent along with the AFP document data stream is come from the resource file and the text file.

Further, the claim recites that the resource pack computer program selects the font mapping object container and sends the font mapping object container in an application-specific AFP resource file at the same time and together with the document data stream

Art Unit: 2178

from the first computer to the second computer. Therefore, *the resource file is not sent together with the AFP document data stream, but only the selected object container is.*

In addition, it appears contradictory in the recited first mode and second mode in claim 57 which is opposite to the recitation of claim 59.

In the first mode, if the font mapping object container is accepted unchanged for a situation when output devices associated with the second computer use standard character font sets, then it means that there is no need for any conversion and no need for a font mapping table for the mapping object container since the second computer uses standard character font sets.

In the second mode, a character conversion of the document data stream is implemented and at least one corresponding replacement font is assembled and the font mapping object container is emptied.

When there is a conversion, then the font mapping table should exist along with the conversion instructions in the font mapping object container (see claim 59) and so the font mapping object container is not emptied.

When no conversion is needed, then there is no need for a font mapping table for a mapping object container, and so the mapping object container should be emptied (see claim 59).

Dependent claims 58-60 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claim.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nakatsuji et al. (US 2001/0043214).

Erickson et al. (US 6,331,895).

Shimamura (US 2002/0089503).

Kawate et al. (US 2004/0076400).

Furukawa et al. (US 2004/0086156).

Proudlar et al. (US 2008/0022128).

Nakatsuji et al. (US 6,633,292).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (8:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Cong-Lac Huynh/
Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
2/15/08